UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/783,524	02/20/2004	Thomas Kuehnel	MSI-1943US	7488

22971   7590   12/17/2008
MICROSOFT CORPORATION
ONE MICROSOFT WAY
REDMOND, WA 98052-6399

EXAMINER
MOORTHY, ARAVIND K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2431	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/17/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

roks@microsoft.com
ntovar@microsoft.com

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>18 September 2008</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>6-8,10-17 and 19-25</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>6-8,10-17 and 19-25</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>20 February 2004</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail. Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is in response to the amendment filed on 2 January 2008.

2. Claims 6-8, 10-17 and 25 are pending in the application.

3. Claims 6-8, 10-17 and 25 have been rejected.

4. Claims 1-5, 9 and 18 have been cancelled.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 6-8, 10-17 and 25 have been considered but are

moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 6-8, 10-14, 17 and 19-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Jonker et al US 2006/0020784 A1 (hereinafter Jonker) in view of Min et al US

2006/0037036 A1 (hereinafter Min).

As to claim 6, Jonker discloses a method of adding a device to an UPnP network,

comprising:

> retrieving, at a control point (i.e. Right Manager) in the UPnP
>
> network [0076], a device description associated with the UPnP device [0077-
>
> 0079];

306602.01

invoking, at the control point, a first authentication process to authenticate the device with the control point [0110-0113];

retrieving, at the control point, a service description associated with the device [0076]; and

retrieving, at the control point, a presentation page associated with the device [0060-0064].

Jonker does not teach that invoking step is accomplished by using an UPnP application programming interface (API).

Min teaches an invoking step that is accomplished by using an UPnP application programming interface (API) [0038-0039].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Jonker so that the invoking step would have been accomplished by using an UPnP application programming interface (API).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Jonker by the teaching of Min because the UPnP API operates without regard to a distributing process of UPnP stacks 112 to 114 of FIG. 1 implemented in order to provide the API. That is, the remote terminal can control the UPnP devices with the same function as that of the UPnP CP in the home network through a UPnP CP set at the remote CP at a remote area [0043].

As to claim 7, Jonker teaches that upon connection to the UPnP network the device multicasts information about itself to a predetermined address [0115-0118].

As to claim 8, Jonker teaches that the control point uses the information multicast

15.   The method of claim 14, wherein the second authentication process

by the device to retrieve the device description [0123-0128].

As to claims 9 and 18, Jonker teaches that the first authentication process comprises:

receiving a certificate from the device [0052]; and

authenticating the device using the certificate [0052].

As to claims 10 and 19, Jonker teaches that the first authentication process further comprises:

sending a certificate from the control point to the device [0105-0108]; and

using the certificate at the device to authenticate the control point with the device [0105-0108].

As to claims 11 and 20, Jonker teaches that the certificate includes a public key associated with the device [0124].

As to claims 12 and 21, Jonker teaches that the certificate is issued by a certificate authority and includes a public key associated with the certificate authority [0109].

As to claims 13 and 22, Jonker teaches that sending the certificate from the control point to the device comprises:

loading the certificate onto a memory module [0144]; and

transferring the certificate from the control point to the device on the memory module [0144].

As to claims 14 and 23, Jonker teaches that the device invokes a second authentication process to authenticate the control point with the device [0134].

As to claims 16 and 25, The method of claim 15, wherein the PIN/password comprises:

>   a credential [0184]; and

>   a hash of a certificate sent from the device to the control point [0184].

As to claim 17, Jonker discloses a method of adding a control point to a UPnP network,
comprising:

>   transmitting a search request multicast from the control point to a
>   predetermined network address [0049];

>   receiving a response to the multicast from at least one device in the UPnP
>   network, wherein the response includes an indicator requesting a secure
>   communication between the device and the control point [0134];

>   invoking, at the control point, a first authentication process to
>   authenticate the device with the control point [0110-0113];

>   retrieving, at the control point, a device description associated with the
>   UPnP device [0076];

>   retrieving, at the control point, a service description associated with the
>   device [0076]; and

>   retrieving, at the control point, a presentation page associated with
>   the device [0060-0064].

Jonker does not teach that invoking step is accomplished by using an UPnP application
programming interface (API).

Min teaches an invoking step that is accomplished by using an UPnP application
programming interface (API) [0038-0039].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Jonker so that the invoking step would have been accomplished by using an UPnP application programming interface (API).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Jonker by the teaching of Min because the UPnP API operates without regard to a distributing process of UPnP stacks 112 to 114 of FIG. 1 implemented in order to provide the API. That is, the remote terminal can control the UPnP devices with the same function as that of the UPnP CP in the home network through a UPnP CP set at the remote CP at a remote area [0043].

7.   Claims 15, 16, 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jonker US 2006/0020784 A1 and Min US 2006/0037036 A1 as applied to claims 6 and 17 above, and further in view of Ito U.S. Patent No. 7,069,587 B2.

As to claims 15 and 24, the Jonker-Min combination does not teach that the second authentication process comprises transmitting a PIN/password from the control point to the device.

Ito teaches an authentication process that includes a control point transmitting a PIN to a device [column 5, lines 66 to column 6 line 16]. Ito teaches that the device is authenticated with the given PIN [column 5, lines 66 to column 6 line 16].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Jonker-Min combination so that the second authentication process would have included the control point transmitting a PIN to the device. The device would have been later authenticated with the PIN.

     15.   The method of claim 14, wherein the second authentication process

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Jonker-Min combination by the teaching of Ito because it prevents any illicit access from unknown devices to a control point [column 2, lines 34-37].

As to claims 16 and 25, Jonker teaches that the PIN/password comprises:

          a credential [0184]; and

          a hash of a certificate sent from the device to the control point [0184].

Conclusion

8.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

306602.01 examiner

should be directed to Aravind K. Moorthy whose telephone number is 571-272-3793. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz R. Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Aravind K Moorthy/
Examiner, Art Unit 2431

/Christopher A. Revak/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2431